

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-10 and 20-27 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-10 and 20-27 stand rejected by the Examiner.
- Claim 6 is amended by Applicants.

### Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 First Paragraph

Claim 26 stands rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states that the subject matter is not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection.

The Specification recites, in relevant part:

A check is then performed at block 767 to determine if the chosen advertisement packages contemplate tiles displayed according to a national in scope. (page 23 lines 10-11).

The rotation scope defines how often and in which geographic portions the banners are to be displayed. (page 23 lines 20-22).

Thus, the subject matter of Claim 26 is included in the original as-filed specification. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection and a reconsideration of Claim 26.

### Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102 (e)

Claims 1-10 and 20 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,189,003 to Leal. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection.

Leal discloses a system and method for deriving search templates for searching of business directory data. According to the method, at least one search criteria is identified that is defined through research about companies in at least one category of business. (col. 2 lines 7-11). Leal discloses a data retrieval system that is operative to allow ready and willing buyers to find and contact qualified businesses. (col. 2 lines 23-25). Lear provides the end

user with a more detailed search tool that can refine and target their search processes to find a qualified vendor of products/services in an electronic directory, narrowing down a list of potential candidates...(col. 2 lines 31-36).

Claim 1 recites, among other things, a method to register business directory listings and advertisements where the directory listing is organized as having a set of tree nodes where the leaf nodes are associated with standard industry codes (SIC).

Leal does not explicitly disclose a method to create business directory listings at all. Leal does not disclose the use of standard industry codes in leaf nodes. Leal does not disclose standard industry codes at all. Leal does not disclose the standard industry code defined leaf node limitations of Claims 1, 5, 20 and amended Claim 6.

Since Leal does not disclose any system or method for the registration or creation of directory listings with leaf nodes using standard industry codes (SICs), it cannot anticipate independent Claims 1, 5, 6 and 20. Accordingly, Leal cannot anticipate dependent Claims 2-5, 7-9 and 21-27. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) anticipation rejection of Claims 1-10 and 20-27 as they patentably define over the cited art.

**Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)**

Claims 21-27 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,189,003 to Leal. As mentioned above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections, Leal does not disclose all of the limitations of independent Claims 1, 5, 20 and amended Claim 6. At minimum, Leal fails to disclose any registration technique. Leal fails to disclose any use of leaf nodes in a tree organization having standard industry codes.

Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made with respect to independent Claims 1, 5, 6 and 20 because at least the limitations of a method to register business directory listings and advertisements using a tree nodes having leaf nodes associated with standard industry codes are not present in the single Leal reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and reconsideration of Claims 21-27 as the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0166 / 144193.1  
**Application No.:** 09/650,605  
**Office Action Dated:** 11/17/2004

**PATENT**

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments and amendment place the claims in a condition for allowance by traversing the Examiner's rejections. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration for all pending claims. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Date: January 6, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jerome G. Schaefer  
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439